

from LexisNexis's alleged sending of unsolicited faxes. Compl. ¶¶ 33-48. Count II asserts a claim for conversion. Compl. ¶¶ 49-60. Count III asserts a claim for violations of the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, incorrectly referred to by Nack as the "Missouri Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act," codified at Mo. Rev. Stat. §§ 407.010 *et seq.* Compl. ¶¶ 61-69.

2. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b) and Local Rule 2.03, LexisNexis attaches a true and accurate copy of the record from the Circuit Court of St. Louis County, Missouri, as obtained by Defendant (**Exhibit A**).

REMOVAL IS TIMELY

3. LexisNexis was served with a copy of the Class Action Petition and summons on April 2, 2012. Removal is timely because this Notice of Removal was filed on May 2, 2012, within 30 days of the date on which LexisNexis was served with the Class Action Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

4. As of this date, LexisNexis has not appeared or filed a responsive pleading in the Action. Other than the filing of the Complaint, no other proceedings have transpired and no orders have been issued by the state court.

FEDERAL QUESTION AND SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION EXISTS

5. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, the United States District Court "shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States."

6. In *Mims v. Arrow Financial Services, LLC*, the United States Supreme Court recently ruled that federal question jurisdiction exists over TCPA claims. --- U.S. ----, 132 S. Ct. 740, 747, 181 L. Ed. 2d 881 (2012) ("We now hold that Congress did not deprive federal courts of federal question jurisdiction over private TCPA suits."); accord *Heller v. H.R.B. Tax Group*,

No. 11 cv 1121, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6167, at *4 (E.D. Mo. Jan. 19, 2012) (denying motion to remand removed Class Action Petition premised on violations of the TCPA); *Nack v. Walburg*, No. 10 cv 478, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8266, at * 10 n.2 (E.D. Mo. Jan. 28, 2011) (“All federal courts of appeals that have considered the question have concluded that federal district courts have federal-question jurisdiction over claims under the TCPA and pendent state law claims.”)

7. Supplemental jurisdiction over Nack’s state law claims for conversion and violations of the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act (Counts II and III) exists because they are also premised on LexisNexis’s alleged sending of unsolicited faxes and, therefore, form part of the same case or controversy within the meaning of under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). *See also Heller*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6167, at *2-4 (federal jurisdiction exists over claims for violation of TCPA, conversion and violation of consumer protection statutes).

VENUE IS PROPER

8. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), the instant action may be removed to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri because it is the United States District Court for the district and division embracing the Circuit Court of St. Louis County, the place where Nack filed the Action.

LEXISNEXIS HAS PROVIDED WRITTEN NOTICE OF REMOVAL

9. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) and Local Rule 2.03, LexisNexis has filed a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of St. Louis County, Missouri. *See*

Exhibit B.

10. LexisNexis has also served Plaintiff’s counsel with a copy of this Notice of Removal.

CONCLUSION

11. The statements made in this Notice of Removal are made for the purpose of removal only, and should not be used by any party for any other purpose.

12. The filing of the instant Notice of Removal in this Court and the filing of the same with the state court immediately serves to confer upon this Court exclusive jurisdiction over Nack's claims and, simultaneously, to divest the state court of jurisdiction with respect to those claims.

WHEREFORE, LexisNexis respectfully requests that the Action now pending in the Circuit Court of St. Louis County, Missouri, Case No. 12SL-CC00991, be removed to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

DATED: May 2, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP

By: /s/ Theodore R. Bynum III
John T. Richmond, Jr. # 45673
john.richmond@huschblackwell.com
Theodore R. Bynum III #60897
t.r.bynum@huschblackwell.com
190 Carondelet Plaza, Ste. 600
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 480-1500

--and--

Jason P. Stiehl (*application for admission to be filed*)

Jordan P. Vick (*application for admission to be filed*)

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
131 South Dearborn Street
Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312)460-5000

Attorneys for Defendant LEXISNEXIS, A
DIVISION OF REED ELSEVIER INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 2, 2012, I caused a copy of NOTICE OF REMOVAL to be served upon the following counsel of record by electronic and First Class U.S. Mail:

Max. G. Margulis
MARGULIS LAW GROUP
28 Old Belle Monte Rd.
Chesterfield, MO 63017
maxmargulis@margulislaw.com

Brian J. Wanca
ANDERSON + WANCA
3701 Algonquin Rd., Ste. 760
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
bwanca@andersonwanca.com

Phillip A. Bock
Bock & Hatch, LLC
134 N. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60602
phil@bockhatchllc.com

/s/Theodore R. Bynum III

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 2, 2012, I caused a copy of MEMORANDUM FOR CLERK to be served upon the following counsel of record by electronic and First Class U.S. Mail:

Max. G. Margulis
MARGULIS LAW GROUP
28 Old Belle Monte Rd.
Chesterfield, MO 63017
maxmargulis@margulislaw.com

Brian J. Wanca
ANDERSON + WANCA
3701 Algonquin Rd., Ste. 760
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
bwanca@andersonwanca.com

Phillip A. Bock
Bock & Hatch, LLC
134 N. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60602
phil@bockhatchllc.com

/s/Theodore R. Bynum III